

Kung 1999-0309

Remarks

Reconsideration of remaining claims 1, 4-14, 17-28, and 30-34 is respectfully requested.

In the Office action dated February 14, 2003, the Examiner rejected various groupings of claims under 35 USC §§ 102(b), 103(a) and also objected to the specification. The Examiner's objections and rejections will be addressed below in the order appearing in the Office action.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner, at page 2 of the Detailed Action, noted a number of places where typographical errors appeared in the specification and thus objected to the specification. In response, applicants have completely reviewed the specification and are submitting with this response a number of amendments to the specification to correct numerous typographical errors. It is believed that the specification is now in proper form.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to claims 3, 9, 16, 22, 28, 29 and 34 based on lack of a proper antecedent bases for various ones of the terms or expressions used in the claims. In response, claims 3, 16, 29 and 34 have been canceled. Claims 9, 22 and 28 have been amended, as noted above, to provide for the proper antecedent basis for each cited term. Applicants request the Examiner to reconsider this objection and find the remaining claims 9, 22 and 28 (as well as any claims that depend therefrom) to now be in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 112, second paragraph Rejection – Claims 26-43

The Examiner first rejected claims 26-43 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the present invention.

Kung 1999-0309

In response, applicants have amended claim 26 to depend from claim 14 (not "claim 1"), where this amendment is considered to address the Examiner's rejection regarding the duplicative nature of claim 26.

Regarding the rejection of claims 27 and 34, claim 34 has been canceled. With respect to claim 27, it is asserted that the phrase "the steps" as used in a method claim is considered to be a well-known term of art as used in such claims and is not considered as defining a particular element or process step that requires a specific antecedent basis. As such, applicants have not amended claims 27. Claims 39 and 41-43 have been canceled from this application, so applicants do not need to address the rejection of these claims. Applicant believes that with the amendment to claim 26 the Examiner's rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph has been fully addressed and requests the Examiner to find the remaining claims in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 102(a) Rejection – Claims 1 and 14

The Examiner cited claims 1 and 14 under 35 USC 102(a) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,825,829 (Borazjani et al). In response, applicants have amended claims 1 and 14 to incorporate the limitation regarding the playing of a greeting and the use of the greeting to properly select one of the multiple ports. Such teaching is not disclosed or suggested by Borazjani et al. and, therefore, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find claims 1 and 14 (as amended) to now be in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 102(b) Rejection – Claims 27-40

Claims 27-40 were next rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US Patent 5,724,411 (Eisdorfer et al.). Applicants cannot agree with the Examiner's conclusion. Firstly, Eisdorfer et al. is considered as limited to use in a conventional telecommunications network and cannot reasonably be extended to use with a "broadband communications system supporting Internet Protocol telephony service", wherein the latter is the subject matter of the present invention and is further directed to allowing for a diversity of various end user devices (telephone, IP phone, PC, etc.) to be coupled to the various ports of a "multiple port" arrangement, with a single "directory

Kung 1999-0309

number” associated with these multiple ports and various end user devices. In contrast, Eisdorfer et al. is associated with *multiple telephone numbers* and a methodology for tracking down one individual associated with these various numbers (see, for example, the Abstract of Eisdorfer et al, where it states “based on the option chosen by the calling party, the incoming call is routed to one or more destination directory numbers where the requested called party is most likely to be found”).

Applicants assert that Eisdorfer et al., being limited to a telecommunications network and a plurality of conventional telephones associated with a plurality of different destination numbers, cannot be found to anticipate the subject matter of the present invention, which is directed to a “broadband communications system supporting Internet Protocol telephony service” as used with a plurality of different end user devices. Applicants thus respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find remaining claims 27, 28 and 30-33 to be in condition for allowance.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claims 2, 11-12, 15, 24-25 and 41-43

The Examiner first rejected claims 2 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as rendered obvious by Borazjani et al. Claims 2 and 15 have been canceled.

Claims 11, 12, 24 and 25 were next rejected by the Borazjani et al., with the exception of showing the support of Internet Protocol-based traffic. US Patent 5,793,413 (Hylton et al.) was cited by the Examiner as including this teaching. In response, applicants assert that this combination of references lacks any teaching of using a “greeting” to select a proper port from a multiple port architecture, where independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to include the use of such a greeting. Since claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 1, and claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 14, applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider this rejection and find the claims allowable.

The Examiner next cited claims 41-43. Claims 41-43 have been cancelled.

35 USC § 103(a) Rejection – Claims 3-10, 13, 16-23 and 26

The above-cited claims were next rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Borazjani et al. and Hylton et al. (as above), in further view of

Kung 1999-0309

Eisdorfer et al. (where Eisdorfer et al. is cited as using a "greeting"). As discussed in the above rejection of claims 27-40, Eisdorfer et al. is directed to a different architecture, and for a different purpose. In particular, Eisdorfer et al. is limited to use in a telecommunications network, where an individual may have a plurality of different destination numbers. The "greeting" in Eisdorfer et al. is used to direct the incoming call to the proper individual when multiple parties are involved. There is no teaching in this combination of references regarding the use of a plurality of different end user devices, and selecting a proper end user device based on a greeting played during call set-up.

Inasmuch as claim 3 has been included in independent claim 1 and claim 16 has been included in independent claim 14, applicants request the Examiner review the rejection to the above-cited claims and find them to be in condition for allowance.

In summary, the present application contains claims 1, 4-14, 17-28 and 30-33. Applicants have amended the specification and the claims to overcome the Examiner's various objections and rejections. Applicants believe that the case, in its present form, is now in condition for allowance and respectfully request an early and favorable response from the Examiner in that regard. If for some reason or other the Examiner does not agree that the case is ready to issue and that an interview or telephone conversation would further the prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Fen-Chung Kung et al.

By: Wendy W. Koba
Wendy W. Koba
Reg. No. 30509
Attorney for applicants
610-346-7112

Date: 4/14/03